

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed March 20, 2008 and declared final. This response is timely. Any fee due with this paper, including any necessary extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Summary

Claims 1, 6-28, 30-36, and 41-49 are pending. Claims 1,

An Interview was conducted with the Examiner, the inventor, Canadian counsel, and the undersigned attorney. Agreement on the claims was not reached, but the Examiner indicated that the inventor's insightful explanation helped to clarify important points. The Examiner's courtesies extended in relation to the interview are greatly appreciated.

Objections

Claims 21-26, 28, 32-36, and 41-47 are objected to as being improper because these multiple claims depend on other multiple claims. Claims 6, 20, 22-26, 30-36, and 41-47 are similar objected to because they depend directly or indirectly on non-elected claims. Claims 21-26, 30-36, and 41-47, these were not examined by U.S. Patent & Trademark Office policy because they depend on multiple dependent claims.

The claims are now amended to depend only from pending claims. Applicant respectfully notes that a multiple dependent fee claim has been paid at the time of filing.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 6-20, 27, and 30-31 as well as claims 28 and 48-49 continue to stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,885,749 to Chang in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,714 to Yoshiura. For the reasons given the interview and the reasons stated

below, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art, alone or in combination with each other, do not teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the features of the present invention which distinguish it from the prior art, are present in claim 1 as follows:

(d) calculating an Assignment Value for at least one other branch of the Oommen-Rueda tree related to a distribution of the ciphertext previously calculated;
and

(h) calculating an Assignment Value for the at least one traversed branch of the Oommen-Rueda tree related to the distribution of the ciphertext previously calculated.

The claimed steps are key in the solution to encoding plaintext to create a ciphertext of the present invention. As explained in the interview none of these steps are taught by the cited art alone or in combination with each other.

The remarks made in the Response of December 17, 2007 are hereby reincorporated by reference.

Independent claims 27 and 28 claim a method of decoding ciphertext. Therein, each claim includes the limitation of:

if a leaf has not been reached, utilizing the same Branch Assignment Rule as utilized to encode the ciphertext to provide Assignment Values for the branches depending from the node that has been reached, receiving the next character of ciphertext, and continuing to traverse the Oommen-Rueda Tree from the node that has been reached towards a leaf, the current symbol of ciphertext determining the branch to then be traversed

Therein, these steps, e.g., step (b) in claim 27 and step (d) in claim 28 comprise the reverse of steps (d) and (h) of claim 1. These steps are not taught by the cited art in any combination.

All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action. Any fee due with this paper, including any necessary extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hassan A. Shakir/
Hassan A. Shakir
Reg. No. 53,922
212.940.6489

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Docket No.: BKCS 21.078 (331443-00004)